

Three Thousand-Year-Old Mystery - Igor Shafarevich (The History of Jewry from the Perspective of Modern Russia)

Chapter 13. Under the communist system.

3. Parting ...

It was only after the end of the war that it was gradually discovered that world Jewry and the communist government in the USSR were not the same thing and that their interests could diverge in some ways. The existence of some differences began to manifest itself since 1948, when the State of Israel arose. The very emergence of this state clearly lay in the area of common interests. It was proclaimed by the UNO Security Council, where the USSR not only did not use the "veto right", but also actively supported this decision. At a meeting of the Security Council, Soviet representative Gromyko said:

The heavy sacrifices that the Jewish people suffered as a result of the tyranny of the Nazis in Europe further underscore the need for the Jews to have their own state and the fairness of the demands for an independent Jewish state in Palestine.

The leaders of Soviet politics hoped to acquire a leverage in the person of Israel for influence in the Middle East, or by inertia they followed the tendencies of world Jewry. The USSR was one of the first states to recognize Israel. It is known that in the outbreak of the Arab - Israeli conflict, the USSR initially supplied Israel with weapons.

But then it turned out that the JAC played a certain independent role, different from the one planned for it by the communist government. It turned out to be the center that attracted the national feelings of the Jews of the USSR. Hundreds of letters were received there with appeals to help Israel more actively: some insisted on permission to go to Palestine, others offered to collect money to help Israel. Then it was something completely unheard of: a person who had a distant relative abroad or received several letters from there, was already vulnerable. But all the work of the EAK was known to the NKVD at least through the secretaries of the Committee. This was superimposed on the fact that the Ambassador of the State of Israel, Golda Meir, was greeted in Moscow by crowds of Jews (usually when she visited her synagogue). Meir herself always adhered to a pro-American orientation, which was soon adopted by the entire policy of Israel.

As it became known later, the EAK itself had already taken a step in this direction even earlier. At the end of the war, in 1944, he sent a letter to the Government, proposing the creation of a Jewish Soviet Socialist Republic in Crimea. It was this term that was used, so that it clearly meant a republic equal in rights to Ukraine or Kazakhstan, which, according to the Soviet constitution, had the right to secede (not to mention its own Communist Party, government, etc.). This was also an unheard-of act in the life of that time. Among the leaders of the EAK they were already "dividing their portfolios":

Mikhoels was expected to be the president of the new republic, and so on. (but judging by what I have read, no rumors about the future "first secretary" have survived, that is, the new state was not planned according to the template of a Soviet republic). All this was a direct violation of the basic principle of the communist government: "decisions are passed only from top to bottom." The government, which had just won a terrible war, felt omnipotent and could not yield. But all her actions show with what difficulty (or fear?) She went into confrontation. First, there was a Politburo resolution on the dissolution of the JAC with a very characteristic postscript: "Do not arrest anyone yet." Then the arrests of the leaders of the JAC began. Mikhoels was apparently killed by MGB agents, and he was officially declared the victim of a transport accident. For more than 20 years, the political elimination in the USSR has not been furnished with such a decoration. It turned out that the Chairman of the Comintern (Zinoviev) or the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars - the heir of Lenin (Rykov) could simply be shot. And to do so with the actor Mikhoels is too dangerous. It would seem that with regard to Mikhoels, Stalin could repeat his question: "How many divisions does the Pope have?" But in some other hierarchy Mikhoels turned out to be more dangerous and weightier than Rykov. The same stamp of caution, not inherent in the communist state machine, rests on the entire "JAC case". The investigation was conducted for more than three years, the trial took place only in 1952. The entire investigation bears traces of some kind of hidden struggle of forces, which was not noticeable before (in the activities of the Cheka-OGPU-NKVD-MGB). In the summer of 1952, the Supreme Court interrupted the investigation in order to send the case for further investigation. But the decision, apparently, had already been made in the Politburo. The trial took place, but it lasted two months (and not several days, as usual). The defendants were free to ask each other questions and challenge their testimonies. But their fate was predetermined, all members of the EAK, except for one woman, academician L. Stern, were sentenced to death (13 people). In other cases related to this, 10 more people were shot. A total of 110 people were repressed.

One can imagine the shock experienced by the communist leadership when it discovered that the "inextricable bond" connecting it with Jewry exists only up to a certain limit. It faced a force from which it had not previously separated itself and the boundaries of whose influence it could not determine. So, Molotov's wife Zhemchuzhina (Karpovskaya) turned out to be very close to Mikhoels, it became known that he called her "a good Jewish daughter" and compared her in the biblical Esther. It is necessary to re-read the "Book of Esther" in order to appreciate the significance of such a comparison. On the other hand, her relative tells about Voroshilov's wife (Golda Gorbman):

When the state of Israel arose, I heard the phrase from Ekaterina Davydovna: Now we also have a homeland. I widened my eyes: this is an orthodox communist internationalist speaking!

(And this means that the Soviet Union, as it was said then, "the homeland of the working people of the whole world" was not a homeland for it!)

And, finally, one of the shot members of the JAC was Lozovsky (Drizo) during the war, the head of the Soviet Information Bureau, deputy. Minister of Foreign Affairs. And Malenkov's daughter was married to the son of an employee Lozovsky Shamberg, while Lozovsky was married to Shamberg's sister. As often happened then, Sr. Shamberg wrote a letter to the Central Committee, in which he assured that he did not know anything about Lozovsky's "spy-nationalist" activities. And Malenkov divorced his daughter from Shamberg Jr. But it was clear that connections were formed here, breaking which, it was necessary to cut through a living body.

After that, a "campaign against cosmopolitans" began, which ended in the "case of doctors" and ended with the death of Stalin. It is these actions that are usually the basis for the assertion that after the war a "policy of anti-Semitism" was established in the USSR and even a plan was being prepared for the "deportation of Jews to Siberia." It is very difficult to reconcile such a view with the then real situation in the country.

First of all, it is wrong to interpret the "JAC case" as an action characterizing the special anti-Jewish orientation of the then Soviet policy. This "case" should be considered against the background of all the life of that time. For example, at about the same time, the "Leningrad affair" was developing, in which a certain "Russian orientation" was apparently considered a crime, although it was expressed much weaker than the "Jewish orientation" in the JAC case. It was about the proposal of a certain group of prominent party leaders to create a Communist Party of the RSFSR, to transfer its Central Committee and Council of Ministers to Leningrad. The main figure among the accused was Voznesensky, a member of the Politburo, for a long time the only 1st deputy of Stalin as before. Council of Ministers. Voznesensky is credited with mobilizing Soviet industry during the war and organizing its restoration. And nevertheless, Voznesensky, unlike Mikhoel, could be tried and shot. In addition to Voznesensky, Kapustin, Kuznetsov, Popkov, Rodionov and others were shot, and in total about 2000 people were repressed. If we consider the "JAC case" as a vivid manifestation of "Stalinist anti-Semitism", then the "Leningrad affair" should be considered an equally vivid manifestation of Stalinist Russophobia.

In fact, in both cases, the regime sought to control some of the national impulses that it had admitted during the war and for its propaganda purposes. These actions were only elements in the chain of measures taken after the war to consolidate the victorious and consolidating communist system. This also included laws on strengthening the collective farm system, tightening ideological control: in science (biology, history), culture (literature, music), etc. But now more and more all this background, which determined real life, is ignored and remains as if one brutal suppression of the germs of Jewish national consciousness, sometimes interpreted even as a continuation of the "tradition of pogroms and blood libel." In fact, the number of repressed in the "Leningrad affair" was apparently much greater than in the "JAC case". In all the cases I know of people arrested in connection with the "JAC case", the victims, although they were not guilty of anything, but from the point of view of the then authorities violated the basic unwritten laws that seemed absolute: for example, they publicly greeted Golda Meir when visiting her synagogues, or were friends with foreign correspondents, etc. Those. from the point

of view of the already strengthened (and still strengthened by the won war) communist regime, as it were, they claimed to be extraterritorial. In all the cases I know of people arrested in connection with the "JAC case", the victims, although they were not guilty of anything, but from the point of view of the then authorities violated the basic unwritten laws that seemed absolute: for example, they publicly greeted Golda Meir when visiting her synagogues, or were friends with foreign correspondents, etc. Those. from the point of view of the already strengthened (and still strengthened by the won war) communist regime, as it were, they claimed to be extraterritorial.

Nevertheless, the regime did not resort to the usual tactics of mass terror, not only against people who violated its unwritten laws, but also "with a margin", against entire strata capable of generating such people. It was clear that there were some frictions, but of a completely new type, which had not yet been encountered in the history of the communist regime.

Let me remind you of the facts. The expression "cosmopolitan" (often with the adjective "rootless") appeared in the newspapers, which, as it was clear to everyone, was associated with Jewish origin. Perhaps it is difficult to establish the identity of these two concepts: "cosmopolitan" - "Jew" (meaning the meaning that was then put into the Soviet press). It was felt that the term "cosmopolitan" was in no way applicable, for example, to Kaganovich, Mehlis, Howard Fest or Yves Montan. Rather, the term "cosmopolitan", in its then use, can be deciphered as "a Jewish nationalist acting contrary to the interests and policies of the party." The cosmopolitans were credited with trying to exert a corrupting influence on the patriotism of Soviet citizens, weaken the integrity and strength of the Soviet system, by infecting Soviet people with bourgeois ideology, to tarnish the historical past of the peoples of the USSR. On the other hand, the concept of "cosmopolitanism" was sometimes understood broader than its Jewish aspect. Thus, many scientific theories - such as Veselovsky's theory of itinerant plots - have been denounced as "cosmopolitan." At the same time, articles of a different type appeared in the newspapers - feuilletons no longer of a political, but of an everyday level, which described the fraudulent machinations of some businessman with an emphatically Jewish name and surname.

There were also practical actions aimed at transferring some Jews from their influential positions to less influential ones. I actually know one example: the removal of several Jews from the posts of heads of departments, as well as the transfer of several others from Moscow to work in the provinces.

Finally, the arrests were made. A group of doctors was arrested, accused of "sabotage" - killing a number of party leaders under the guise of treating a number of party leaders and attempting to kill others, including Stalin. Most of these doctors were Jewish, but there were a few Russians among them. However, the Jewish aspect of this action was highlighted by accusations of ties to a Jewish charity, the Joint. This case was dropped immediately after Stalin's death. All those sentenced to imprisonment in the camps in the JAC case, as well as those under investigation in other cases, were released.

Newspaper campaign, dismissals, arrests, executions ... At first glance, we are faced with a typical Stalinist purge - like the persecution of "pest statisticians", "Trotskyists", "right deviators", like the purge in the army and in the Soviet apparatus in 1936-37 etc. However, looking closely, you immediately become convinced that there is some completely different phenomenon here. The displacements had a completely different character: from the heads of a university department - not to felling, but to the heads of a sector of an institute of the Academy of Sciences or another institute. The transfer to work in the provinces was not in the nature of a rude exile, on the eve of arrest. The person concerned was summoned to the Ministry, where, as a rule, he was offered to go to some distant city, like Vladivostok. But then something began in other cases impossible: this person refused, put forward its own conditions, and after long negotiations agreed to go to work somewhere very close, for example, to Serpukhov or Kolomna, where you can travel from Moscow. Even more indicative was the atmosphere surrounding those who were victims of such measures: meetings were not convened where they would be exposed of all possible sins, and their colleagues would repent of losing their vigilance, acquaintances would not turn away from them, at a new job they were treated without any suspicion. In a strange way, the atmosphere was filled with confidence that no catastrophe was threatening here. meetings were not convened where they would be accused of all possible sins, and their colleagues would repent of the loss of vigilance, acquaintances would not turn away from them, at their new job they were treated without any suspicion. In a strange way, the atmosphere was filled with confidence that no catastrophe was threatening here. meetings were not convened where they would be accused of all possible sins, and their colleagues would repent of the loss of vigilance, acquaintances would not turn away from them, at their new job they were treated without any suspicion. In a strange way, the atmosphere was filled with confidence that no catastrophe was threatening here.

Attention should also be paid to this side of this situation. The entire campaign was carried out by people with extensive experience in cleaning, who formed a known *standard* of how to do it. So that in this case everything does not go along this standard path: mass arrests of everyone belonging to the persecuted group of the population, the disenfranchised position of persons somehow connected with them, numerous courts, tens and hundreds of thousands of those executed - so that events *do not unfold along this familiar stencil* , special, strict and precise instructions were needed. Otherwise, the habit that has already become second nature would have worked. Thus, it seems to me certain that *this whole action was conceived as an action unusual in the previous policy, in its scale completely inconsistent with the usual patterns of purges, as something fundamentally different from them - and careful measures were taken to ensure that it was implemented in this way* .

How do you assess what happened? Apparently, we are faced here with the first case of some kind of friction between the Party and Jewry, with the first case when the interests of these forces in some way did not coincide. The fact that earlier, for three decades, such a situation has never occurred, shows their amazing affinity. They do not coincide, neither one can be considered an organ of the other, but they are so closely related that between them there has never been at least the slightest noticeable

friction. On the contrary, careful measures were taken to eliminate possible misunderstandings: Jewish support for Soviet power in the West, laws outlawing anti-Semites, or support for widespread Jewish cultural and national activities in the USSR. When, in the 1930s, a large number of Jews who suffered in the ranks of the opposition could cause the alarm of Jews, Stalin and Molotov come out with fierce attacks on "anti-Semites". All this can be explained only by the fact that at that time each of the two forces perceived the other as absolutely necessary for itself, without close cooperation, none of them could hope to achieve their "goals" (understanding this term in the sense that we indicated at the beginning of the work). And this, seemingly indissoluble, connection appeared in 1948-1953. noticeably weakened. The meaning of the upheaval that took place then in relations between the Party and Jewry can be seen in the fact that they which we indicated at the beginning of work). And this, seemingly indissoluble, connection appeared in 1948-1953. noticeably weakened. The meaning of the upheaval that took place then in relations between the Party and Jewry can be seen in the fact that they which we indicated at the beginning of work). And this, seemingly indissoluble, connection appeared in 1948-1953. noticeably weakened. The meaning of the upheaval that took place then in relations between the Party and Jewry can be seen in the fact that they *divided* , henceforth began to act as two independent forces. Independent, but by no means hostile: the events that took place in our country during these years are only debates, inevitable when two such powerful forces are delimited.

An example of how closely the communist government continued to be associated with Jewry is the history of the transfer of American secrets of the production of atomic weapons to the Soviet Union. The most dramatic episodes of this story date back to the era of World War II, and the roots go even deeper, but even after the war, amazing events took place here. They are described, for example, by the head of Soviet intelligence in this area, General Sudoplatov. He writes that during the war, 90% of the agents from whom important information was obtained were Jews. The establishment of contact between the Soviet intelligence and the scientific director of the American atomic project Oppenheimer also dates back to the time of the war (the role played in this by the EAC was mentioned above). In more detail, Sudoplatov reports:

In using Oppenheimer as a source, Vasily Zarubin's wife Elizabeth played an important role ... She possessed a classic Semitic beauty that attracted men and was one of the most successful recruiting agents ... She came from a family of revolutionaries, relatives of Anna Pauker, founder of the Communist Party of Romania ...

This amazing woman was at first the wife of Blumkin, who worked (including) for Trotsky. She reported on him and he was shot. Then she was abandoned in the United States and worked under the leadership of Heifetz. The author attributes to their influence that Oppenheimer invited Fuchs, an emigrant from Germany, to work in Los Alamos. She also played a decisive role in the "use" of Leo Szilard - a Jew from Hungary. After the war, Beria ordered to stop receiving information from Oppenheimer and Szilard and to focus them on the fight against the creation of the American

hydrogen bomb. And Fuchs moved to England in 1946 and systematically passed on information to a Soviet agent until Fuchs's arrest in 1950. I can learn something about this period from my own memories. I remember how much later, in the 1970s, the late A.D. Sakharov told me, that Fuchs' information actually contained all American atomic secrets, everything that can be conveyed in writing. So, the necessary costs, fossils, human experience cannot be conveyed on paper - and Fuchs told us the rest. I remember that then it seemed to me too fantastic, I thought that Sakharov was exaggerating. But Sudoplatov's memoirs paint roughly the same picture. He also says that the data obtained provided the main thing: confidence that the accumulated stock of atomic bombs by the Americans is insufficient to start an atomic war before the mid-1950s. And the same memories of Sudoplatov show what a truly irreplaceable role in obtaining information was played by Jewish aid: from the main figures of the atomic project - Oppenheimer and Szilard, to "connected" like Cohen or the Rosenberg spouses,

It remains for us to consider the version of the planned Jewish pogrom and the eviction of Jews to Siberia. The concept of the "final solution to the Jewish question," allegedly prepared but not implemented by Stalin, is as follows. It is argued that Stalin intended to organize a show trial of "killer doctors". There, in particular, a new (in comparison with other similar processes) character was supposed to appear - a public prosecutor, this role was intended for Ehrenburg. The defendants, of course, must be found guilty and sentenced to be hanged in Red Square. But on the way, the indignant people execute them themselves and begin a Jewish pogrom. Protecting Jews from this pogrom, the authorities put them on a train and send them to Siberia. The construction of barracks for exiled Jews has already begun there.

When Stalin allegedly outlined this plan to his comrades-in-arms, he faced resistance: Kaganovich opposed and even tore up his identity card as a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee. Stalin offered to vote - everyone turned out to be against him. For the first time in his life, meeting the opposition of his comrades-in-arms, Stalin was so agitated that he suffered a blow from which he never recovered. It is worth trying to think over this story, as it becomes obvious that it is becoming more implausible. Stalin and any other entourage could not at that time (even if they wanted) to find support in the party for such a grandiose action. This is how Avtorkhanov describes, for example, Jewish influence in the Politburo of that time ("The Mystery of Stalin's Death"). Of the 11 members of the Politburo:

Kaganovich is a Jew.

Beria is 1/2 Jewish (his mother was Jewish, but more importantly, he relied, as we will soon see, on Jewish support).

Molotov

Andreev had wives of Jewish women

Voroshilov

Malenkov's daughter's husband was Jewish.

Khrushchev's son's wife was Jewish.

Terror in the country has not had such a scale for a long time (eviction of hundreds of thousands). I have already said that the oppression of the Jews was then of a very limited nature, in no way corresponding to such a cruel measure. The "courageous" resistance of Stalin's comrades-in-arms, especially Kaganovich, who earlier calmly betrayed his brother for death, looks unrealistic. But most importantly, tens, probably even hundreds of thousands of people should have been involved in the preparation of such a grandiose event. All Jews had to be counted (and a "definition" of a Jew had to be worked out: by passport, by nationality of one or both parents). It was necessary to instruct the detachments that made the arrests, to prepare the trains, even to change the schedule of railway traffic: several million people had to be transferred simultaneously from one end of the country to the other. Where are the witnesses of this? Since then, several hundred thousand people have emigrated from various strata of Soviet society: there should have been witnesses among them, and, of course, they would have told the details. Ehrenburg insisted that he was shown a letter from the Moscow Jewish intelligentsia asking for the eviction of Jews, and he allegedly refused to sign it - why did no one see this letter again? Dozens of such questions arise. that he was shown a letter from the Moscow Jewish intelligentsia asking for the eviction of Jews, and he allegedly refused to sign it - why did no one else see this letter? Dozens of such questions arise. that he was shown a letter from the Moscow Jewish intelligentsia asking for the eviction of Jews, and he allegedly refused to sign it - why did no one else see this letter? Dozens of such questions arise.

I later read with satisfaction in Sudoplatov's memoirs that he considers this version implausible on the basis of the same arguments.

In order to appreciate this story, it is very important that we know its origins. She appeared in the West and became known there from two "independent" sources. The first was Ehrenburg, who told Sartre about this in great secrecy. In other words, every effort was made to make this story widely known in the West. The second source is even more obvious - it is the Soviet ambassador to Holland, Ponamarenko (formerly a member of the Central Committee presidium and secretary of the Central Committee). (These sources were reported several times, for example, in Avtorkhanov's book *The Mystery of Stalin's Death*.) Thus, it is most plausible that this story was deliberately launched into the West by Stalin's heirs. Its meaning is obvious: it must. was to prove that the new leadership not only did not harbor bad intentions towards the Jews, but risked their lives in order to to save them from persecution. This assumption is supported by other similar statements. So, Khrushchev says in his memoirs that Stalin, in a table conversation, gave him the idea to arrange a Jewish pogrom at one of the Moscow factories, but he, Khrushchev, did not react to this proposal in any way. It is also, of course, just a declaration of a good attitude towards

Jews, for history itself, according to the mores of that time, is not real. No matter how Khrushchev treated the Jews (their support could be very important for him), at that moment they could not protect him from the fact that he would be arrested and shot on the same night. that Stalin, in a table conversation, gave him the idea of organizing a Jewish pogrom at one of the Moscow factories, but he, Khrushchev, did not react to this proposal in any way. It is also, of course, just a declaration of a good attitude towards Jews, for history itself, according to the mores of that time, is not real. No matter how Khrushchev treated the Jews (their support could be very important for him), at that moment they could not protect him from the fact that he would be arrested and shot on the same night. that Stalin, in a table conversation, gave him the idea of organizing a Jewish pogrom at one of the Moscow factories, but he, Khrushchev, did not react to this proposal in any way. It is also, of course, just a declaration of a good attitude towards Jews, for history itself, according to the mores of that time, is not real. No matter how Khrushchev treated the Jews (their support could be very important for him), at that moment they could not protect him from the fact that he would be arrested and shot on the same night.

Thus, it's time, apparently, to hand over this story finally to the archive, recognizing it as a legend, in which it is interesting only *for what purpose* it is created. The popularity of the legend is explained by the fact that both forces acting in this area were interested in its dissemination: the party leadership, which inherited power after Stalin, and Jewry. Stalin's heirs - because during the transitional period, when their power had not yet been established, they thereby demonstrated their disposition towards Jewry, declared that the existing disagreements would not develop into a serious rupture. Jewishness - since this emphasized the position of Jews in the USSR as persecuted, persecuted by the communist government, and this, firstly, mobilized them and the West to defend their violated rights, and, secondly, put an end to the delicate problem of their role in the Revolution and in governing the country for 25 years following the revolution.

In this regard, the question of the cause of Stalin's death involuntarily comes to mind. Of course, he died at an age when death, most likely, occurs for reasons that are not at all mysterious. But if we discuss the "mystery of Stalin's death", then it is very natural to put it in connection with the friction that arose then between the party led by Stalin and Jewry. As an important factor in this situation, attention should be paid to Beria, on the one hand, who for a long time headed the almost omnipotent security organs, and on the other, apparently relied on powerful Jewish support. This is evident, for example, in the struggle that was then taking place in the communist parties of the Eastern European countries. Apparently, their leadership was mainly Beria's henchmen. At the same time, it consisted mostly of Jews. For example,

The first target against the positions of the power of Beria was Czechoslovakia. Beria provided all the key positions of power there to his allies. However, one striking feature characterizes this entire action. Almost all of the arrested high ranks headed by their leader Rudolf Slansky (whose real name is

Seltsman) - Bedrich Gelinder, Rudolf Margolis, Andre Simone, Arthur London and nine other protégés of Beria were Jews.

Douglas Reed quotes a 1952 quote from the English newspaper The New Statesman that paints a similar picture:

In Czechoslovakia, as in the rest of central and southeastern Europe, the entire party intelligentsia, like the leaders of the secret police, are largely Jewish in origin; ordinary citizens are accustomed, therefore, to identify the party bosses with Jews and blame the "Jewish communists" for all the troubles.

In Poland, Beria's direct support was the head of state security, Jakub Berman. Of the three persons in whose hands the power was - Gomulka, Berut and Berman - the last two were called Beria's henchmen.

In this regard, it can be recalled that the "doctors' case" was simultaneously directed against Beria - he was indirectly accused of insufficient vigilance, and his protegee, the Minister of Internal Affairs Abakumov, was then arrested.

It can be assumed that Stalin, trying to become more independent in relation to Jewish influence, tried to limit the power of Beria, whose Jewish connections were, of course, clear to him. But did he make it? After all, the Jewish side, probably, not without a fight, yielded its exclusive position. It is no coincidence that when discussing any variants of the "riddle of Stalin's death" Beria turns out to be the key to the "riddle". After Stalin's death, of course, the question immediately arose of how further relations between the Party and Jewry would develop. It is unlikely, however, that the new leadership was ready to abandon the more independent position in relation to Jewry, which was achieved under Stalin. Perhaps this was one of the reasons for the overthrow of Beria. But, taught by the fate of Stalin, it had to look for some ways, to reassure the Jewish forces inside and outside the country that there is no serious aggressive intentions. Here the legend about Stalin's heirs, who risked their lives, saved Soviet Jews from exile to Siberia, could come in handy. Takal's scheme seems logical to me, although this, of course, does not mean that it has actually been implemented.

Discussion of the legend about the deportation of Jews prepared by Stalin slightly reveals the tendencies that prevailed among his heirs and leads to an examination of the post-Stalinist era. In this era, we meet with a completely new and extremely important phenomenon - the emergence of Jewish emigration from the USSR. Here again we are faced with the fact that on an issue vital to Jewry, the Soviet leadership yields to Jewish insistence. Earlier we met a similar example in connection with the creation of the state of Israel. However, now the situation is much more dramatic, since it was necessary to make a decision that affected not the territory located far from the Soviet borders, but the internal life of the Soviet Union. Moreover, one of the foundations of this life. It seemed that as long as the Soviet Union existed, there could be no talk of any emigration, the monopoly power of the state over a person cannot be shaken. Suffice it to recall the laws on defectors: they were considered treason, and

even their family members were subject to exile. Yes, psychologically, this attitude has been preserved: emigration was equated with treason. It is all the more striking that against this background Jewish emigration was allowed.

The very fact of such a huge principled concession is much more important than the ways in which it was achieved. However, these pressure methods are also interesting. Here, first of all, the American economic pressure is striking; it is usually considered the main factor. It is unlikely, however, that this is true. After all, after the end of the war, Stalin resolutely rejected the offer to join the Marshall Plan, the bait of billions of dollars in loans. And then the West would undoubtedly be satisfied with incomparably smaller concessions on its part. Apparently there were other, more effective methods of pressure. And since it is not clear what kind of pressure other than economic pressure could come from outside (the influence of "world public opinion" can hardly be taken seriously), it is logical to assume that it was the pressure of the *Soviet Jewry*, which continues to maintain an influential position in the party and Soviet apparatus and to which the Soviet leadership had to make concessions, no matter how painful they were for him.

Another touchstone for clarifying the relationship between the party and Jewry is the attitude of the USSR to the state of Israel. It would seem that it is such that it could not be worse. [This was written in the 1970s] But let's first of all discard the propaganda campaign, because in politics, "swearing doesn't hang at the gate". What remains is the supply of weapons and instructors to Israel's enemies in the Middle East. Of course, this is painful for Israel, when from time to time terrorists equipped with Soviet weapons from neighboring countries make raids on its territory. But Israel can respond to this with the same, only much more effective raids on the territory of Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Iraq. A serious question for him and for all Jewry is whether his neighbors can threaten his existence. Here Soviet policy underwent a decisive test during the Arab-Israeli war in 1972. When, after the outbreak of hostilities, the United States began a massive supply of weapons to Israel, the fate of the war was decided by whether the USSR entered the race with it in this regard. But the USSR refused the race, and the Arabs lost the war, which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. When, after the outbreak of hostilities, the United States began a massive supply of weapons to Israel, the fate of the war was decided by whether the USSR would enter the race with it in this regard. But the USSR refused the race, and the Arabs lost the war, which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. When, after the outbreak of hostilities, the United

States began a massive supply of weapons to Israel, the fate of the war was decided by whether the USSR would enter the race with it in this regard. But the USSR refused the race, and the Arabs lost the war, which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it. which predetermined the reorientation of Egyptian President Sadat to America, as he saw that only in this way he could achieve at least some concessions. Again, the USSR made the decision in which Jewry was interested, although thanks to this it lost its most powerful foothold in the Middle East - Egypt. We see that in matters of vital importance from the Jewish point of view, the party has always yielded to Jewry, no matter how painful this concession was for it.

On the other hand, the party's struggle to maintain some degree of independence from Jewish influence continued. To what extent has this trend brought about social change so far? How useful communal, conscientiously processed statistical material would be here! Of course, we have nothing like this at our disposal. And the picture, the general impression, is determined by Jewish complaints that are heard here, and especially loudly in the West. But here Dostoevsky's words about a people who can complain louder than all others come to mind. And this has really been the case since antiquity. For example, Josephus claims that the number of those killed in Jerusalem during the uprising suppressed by Titus was 1 million 100 thousand people, while, according to Tacitus's calculations, the entire population of Jerusalem - men, women and children - was only 600 thousand. human. We meet a similar picture in almost all countries about which we manage to obtain information. So, at the beginning of the twentieth century. in Germany, newspapers often wrote about the unequal, flawed position of the Jews; societies existed to eliminate it. At the same time, in secondary schools (higher than the public school), the percentage of Jews studied was 4-5 times more than Christians, there were 5.5 times more students, and 20 times more professors and associate professors. Jews on average were 3-4 times richer than Christians, among directors of the largest enterprises they accounted for 13%, in supervisory boards - 24%, and in the entire population - 1%. (The information is taken from the book by W. Sombart.) societies existed to eliminate it. At the same time, in secondary schools (higher than the public school), the percentage of Jews studied was 4-5 times more than Christians, there were 5.5 times more students, and 20 times more professors and associate professors. Jews on average were 3-4 times richer than Christians, among directors of the largest enterprises they accounted for 13%, in supervisory boards - 24%, and in the entire population - 1%. (The information is taken from the book by W. Sombart.) societies existed to eliminate it. At the same time, in

secondary schools (higher than the public school), the percentage of Jews studied was 4-5 times more than Christians, there were 5.5 times more students, and 20 times more professors and associate professors. Jews on average were 3-4 times richer than Christians, among directors of the largest enterprises they accounted for 13%, in supervisory boards - 24%, and in the entire population - 1%. (The information is taken from the book by W. Sombart.)

We have already reminded that at the beginning of the century Max Nordau quite seriously stated that Jews are the poorest nation in the world. Poorer than the Eskimos. In 1911 (at the 9th Zionist Congress), he spoke about the persecution of Jews - "a crime against millions of innocent people, unprecedented in history so full of beatings" (!). Now it is not even possible to understand what kind of oppression of the Jews he had in mind. Even now, with the unprecedented domination of Jews in the United States, there is an "Anti-Defamation League" there, which aims to fight discrimination against Jews. More recently, she issued a statement that the number of Jews employed in the banking business is too small, that this business is a bastion of anti-Semitism!

So we will not rely on the picture assimilated by the whole world, but turn to those scraps of facts that we can still get.

Apparently, there is no doubt that gradually many Jews were ousted from some of the most important, key positions of Soviet society: the top of the party (for example, secretaries of regional committees), generals, the uppermost layer of the diplomatic corps, perhaps the leadership of the KGB. But this is still very far from discrimination of the entire Jewish population, to attempts to lower its social status. (Why, in fact, the presence of a significant group of Jews in the Politburo or the Council of Ministers would help to raise the status of all Jews? To explain, one would have to assume that, in high positions, Jews act not as representatives of a party or state, but as Jewish nationalists, representatives of Jewry. But it is precisely such a conclusion that Jews usually resent with indignation as "anti-Semitic.") How was it not? This is where we enter an area where factual evidence is negligible. Of course, in some places they tried to restrict the admission of Jews to work; in some (literally, several) higher educational institutions, the admission of Jews was limited. On the other hand, there is no doubt that in many areas their influence remained very strong. For example, in science. In the field of ideology. So, in the Academy of Sciences, among academicians and corresponding members, Jews accounted for more than 10% (and in the whole country - only 0.8%). There were even more Jews in the Union of Soviet Writers or the Union of Soviet Composers. Unfortunately, the reference books published in our country, as a rule, bypassed the question of nationality (and I cannot think of another explanation as a desire not to sharpen the topic discussed here). But there was an exception: the directory of the Union of Composers of the RSFSR for 1968-1972. indicates the national composition of the Union (the oversight of the beat was corrected, and in the next editions these data disappeared). We learn that as of June 1, 1973, out of 874 members of the Union, Russians - 484, Jews - 218, followed by Armenians - 34, Tatars - 25, etc. Jews make up about 1/4 of all members of the Union. In the Leningrad organization

there are even more than 36% of them, in the Moscow - 28.5% - due to the fact that in Chuvashia - 0, Buryatia - 0, Voronezh organization - 0, Upper Volga - 1 (for 20 members), etc. It is necessary to take into account the very principle of counting: nationality is determined by a survey or by a passport. And with this principle of counting (adopted in the census), Jews accounted for 0.8% of the population in 1970. Nowadays the majority of Jews are registered as Russians according to their passports. Consequently, in reality, the number of Jews in the Sovka of Composers of the RSFSR was much higher: obviously, that the Jews constituted the majority there, and with the half-breeds the overwhelming majority. And in the memoirs of a composer who lived at that time, I found a mention that the leadership of the Leningrad Union of Composers was: chairman Fingert, executive secretary Jochelson, second secretary Kesselman, organizational secretary Kurz.

I will also refer to a recent book by V. Toporov. In the preface, the author says that he is a 100% Jew, baptized by a nanny who was fired for this, an atheist and a Russian patriot. That is, he everywhere feels out of place, and this pushes him to a kind of observation, often disguised as the reader's fractions (the subtitle of the book is the confessions of a brawler. So he writes:

The petty-bourgeois mass of small-town Jewry formed the main personnel reserve of the social - proletarian in self-name and goal-setting - revolution.

And referring to the alleged interlocutor - a Jew, he says:

Reject the accusation of the Jewish yoke of 1917-1937 - there was no such yoke. Although, do not forget about the exclusive Jewish predominance in the punitive and propaganda systems of a self-fulfilling Utopia.

And specifically he reports about the "pre-perestroika" time:

About eighty percent of the Leningrad Writers' Organization consisted of explicit or disguised Jews.

Both the material and social situation (the opportunity to get a better job, study) is much higher among the urban population than in the countryside, especially in large cities, and the population of Moscow was (as now) the chosen elite. Therefore, an important social characteristic of the position of any group of the population is its distribution between the countryside, city, big cities and Moscow. In this regard, we present data from the Jewish samizdat magazine "Culture":

Almost all Jews (96-98%) live in cities, and in large cities in disproportionately large numbers than in small and medium-sized ones. Further, the author cites figures: in Ukraine, Jews make up less than 3% of the population, and in Kiev - 10%, in the USSR (and the RSFSR) - 1%, and in Moscow - 3.5%.

We will give some figures related to the issue of education. This, of course, is only one of many aspects of the problem, but it is typical of the general situation and, perhaps, it was on this occasion that there were the most protests at that time. At the same time, in order for our information to be guaranteed unbiased (or, rather, so that their bias could only be one-sided), we will take them only from Jewish sources.

An article by I. Domalsky was published in the Russian-language magazine "Time and We", published in Israel. In it, the author reports (referring to the Soviet statistical yearbook "The National Economy of the USSR") that in the 1972/3 academic year there were 4630.2 thousand students in the USSR, of which 88.5 thousand were Jews, i.e. 1.9%. If we take into account that according to the 1970 census, Jews constitute 0.8% of the population, then we see that even according to these data, the percentage of Jews among students was more than twice their percentage among the population. Access to graduate school and further to scientific activity is indicated by other information from the same article (here the author refers to the brochure "Statistical Materials for the Anniversary of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR", which has not yet been sold to the public). Among scientific workers in 1973, Jews accounted for 6.1%. So, their percentage was 7.5 times more, than their share in the population! (Interestingly, the author - apparently with disapproval - emphasizes that Russians accounted for 66.7% of scientific workers, accounting for only 53.0% of the country's population, i.e. their percentage is 1.2 times more than the share in the population!)

And in a later book by R. Ryvkina, it is reported that the percentage of Jewish students was constantly decreasing - 7.5 in 1927. to 3.7 in 1959 and 2.18 in 1962. While the proportion of Jews in the population was less than 0.2. She writes:

they actively used the rights granted to them and during the years of Soviet power, having successfully integrated into the social structure of Soviet society, they achieved a lot.

The first post-war years caused a tremendous surge in the social activity of Jews. This "surge", as she says, and later created a kind of channels for the subsequent, smoother integration of Jews into Russian society.

The author gives a summary:

Jews occupied a very prominent place in the structure of Soviet society: the share of Jews among scientists, university workers, and medical workers was much higher than the average among the country's urban population.

(Note that the comparison is made only with the *urban* population). For example, there were almost five times more scientific workers and university professors among Jews than among the urban population.

In another issue of the same magazine Vremya I Us, an interview with the sociologist Zeev Katz, who teaches Soviet sociology at the University of Jerusalem, is

given. Mentioning that in the United States between 80% and 90% of Jews have received higher education in the past decade, and that the situation is similar in France, Italy, Argentina, Romania, the author continues:

The same applies to the younger generation of Jews in the Soviet Union. Approximately 70% graduate from universities and institutes, *being the most educated part of the youth in the CCCP* (emphasis mine - I.Sh.).

All the facts that I know confirm the accuracy of this last observation. And even much broader: Jews in the USSR in the 70s and 80s were the most privileged social group - in the field of education, access to prestigious spheres of activity, material well-being. They lived in cities, mostly large ones, and almost they alone had the opportunity to emigrate. Of course, they defended this position in the struggle and competition with employees of other nationalities of the Soviet and party apparatus, who saw in them dangerously influential competitors and rivals. But we are now interested in the result of this competition ...

And in the government itself, the position of Jewry was weighty. For example, Brezhnev had two foreign policy advisers. The responsibility of one was to formulate the foreign policy of the USSR in relation to the West, the other to the East. They are both Jews.

After the collapse of the communist system, a whole literature arose describing the oppression to which the Jews were then subjected. A typical example is the book with the dramatic title "Captured by the Red Pharaoh", from which we cite several excerpts (they refer, however, only to the period before Stalin's death). It contains letters denunciations to "higher authorities" or conclusions of commissions created in response to such "signals". Here are examples of the statements it contains:

At the Bolshoi Theater:

Director (acting)	Leontiev	Jew
Chief conductor	Lynching	Jew
conductor	Fire	Jew
conductor	Melik-Pashaev	Armenian
conductor	Steinberg	Jew
conductor	Nebolsin	Russian
deputy. director	Gabovich	Jew
branch B.T.		
thin Hands. Ballet	Messerer	Jew

head chorus	Cooper	Jew
head orchestra	Kaufman	Jew
chief concert maestro	bug	Jew
chief administrator	Sadovnikov	Jew

In the editorial board of "Komsomolskaya Pravda": half of the leading employees were Russians and half were Jews.

In the editorial office of the Trud newspaper, as a result of persecution, the number of Jews who worked in the editorial office decreased from 50% in 1950 to 20% in 1951.

In medicine: in Moscow there are 3 institutes of psychiatry, 4 clinics and 5 neuropsychiatric hospitals. All these institutions, with the exception of one institute, are headed by doctors of Jewish nationality.

I myself was a contemporary of such campaigns, often, in their individual aspect, very unfair - because quite often near jobs, they were fired (or transferred to another job) just more decent people. Many times I then wondered: what is it? Initiative from below or instruction from above? And in the end I came to the conclusion that - and that, and another. At all levels there was a struggle for a "place in the sun" and not only for themselves, but also for their children.

The process, in fact, was completely natural, which began during the Great Patriotic War. The mass of Russians began to make their way to power, in particular, to the party. A Jewish-Russian competition arose, largely unnamed, and continued for a long time with varying success. These party Russians, deprived of national identity, timidly stopped before a clear formulation of their ideology, it would seem, had no chance against Jewish cohesion, which still carries traces of "classical Judaism" and kagal organization. But in their hands were the mechanisms created much earlier, in the 20s and 30s, for the struggle, mainly, with Russian social groups: the descendants of nobles, priests, etc. It was a pervasive system of detailed questionnaires, "special departments" in all institutions, and so on. They used this weapon to fight their Jewish competitors. Their ancestors, Russian nobles, priests, peasants, perhaps, would disdain to use such means. But this was a generation that already viewed the established lifestyle as something set. And, as a rule, not the cleanest aspired to go to power, to the party. As a result, Jewry was basically ousted from some spheres of life, which it regarded as legally belonging to itself: the top of the KGB, the army, the diplomatic corps, from some prestigious universities in the capital. Of course, this was not at all like the extermination of nobles, priests, "old intellectuals" in 1918-20. or collectivization. But for "Jewry" - for those who were "in the Jewish sphere", it was perceived as something monstrous, unheard of (I think quite sincerely). And Jewry recoiled with indignation from the communist system. It was a turning point that has been noticeable throughout my life. I remember how I noticed: earlier (for example, before the war), in the presence of a

Jew (or married to a Jew or a Jew), they tried not to speak negatively about the system. And not always out of fear that he would report - but it seemed tactless, like talking in front of a man about the frivolous adventures of his wife. And in the 1960s and 70s. the Jew was usually a skeptic who did not expect anything good from "this system" or "this people." before the war), in the presence of a Jew (or married to a Jew or a Jew), they tried not to speak negatively about the system. And not always out of fear that he would report - but it seemed tactless, like talking in front of a man about the frivolous adventures of his wife. And in the 1960s and 70s. the Jew was usually a skeptic who did not expect anything good from "this system" or "this people."

Then the so (later) called human rights movement appeared. It would seem that there really were a lot of injustices in life and, mainly, concerning non-Jews: collective farmers did not have passports, religion was oppressed, etc. But in this "movement" the Jews were represented completely disproportionately. Take at least the sensational trials of that time: Daniel and Sinyavsky, Ginzburg and Galanskov, etc. That is, the situation was similar to what was in the revolutionary movement before 1917. And, more importantly, as a result, only the demands of freedom of emigration became audible from the entire movement - basically, it was Jewish emigration.

And the very strong desire of Jews to emigrate indicated a change in their position in the USSR, which caused their dissatisfaction and discontent. This discontent was vividly reflected in the publications of emigrated Jews. In my old work "Russophobia" there are many examples of contemptuous, directly hostile statements by new emigrants about Russia and the Russians. It seems to me that their mood was most accurately captured by the poet (I. Brodsky), who said about Russia:

Where, roughly speaking, the grand plan is screw up.

Apparently, there were some (perhaps vague, clearly not formulated) expectations about Russia, into which the Russians stubbornly refused to fit in. Reading the works of Jewish authors published in the West, I was often amazed at the time that Russians evoke more hatred than Germans. So, Zinaida Shakhovskaya quotes from Amos Oz's "Late Love", where the author indulges in fantasies about how Jewish tanks are marching across Russia:

The Russian land trembles and groans. Churches are crumbling and falling. Kiev, Kharkov, Dnieper, Rostov - everything has been defeated, everything has been swept off the face of the earth. Revenge! Revenge!

It was in this cauldron of emotions that the concept of the persecution of Jews in the USSR, or even of the persecution of Jews, as the main crime of the communist regime, was then formed.

But this emigration in scale could not be compared with the multimillion-dollar pre-revolutionary Jewish emigration. The overwhelming majority of the Jewish population remained in the USSR and continued to wage a stubborn struggle to preserve their privileged position. Then there were dozens and hundreds of ways to overcome the measures taken by the competing part of the apparatus. Here is a memorable history of those times.

The daughter of an acquaintance worked for a magazine that regularly published letters from readers. Many letters came there, where irritated authors wrote out the Jewish surnames, names and patronymics of those who were accused of some kind of fraud. And the head of the department where the letters went was a Jew. So he calls the girl and asks:

-Child, you're not an anti-Semite?

-Of course not!

-So why focus on these vulgar attacks? You change the surnames to some ordinary ones - well, there is Sidorov or Petrov.

And now a magazine comes out with descriptions of the adventures of the mythical Sidorovs and Petrovs ...

There were other ways, based on the influence that remained in the Central Committee apparatus and in the government in general. From time to time, those who too zealously tried to make room for the "Russian cadres" were paid with careers. A striking example was the fate of the party philosopher GF Aleksandrov - at one time the head of Agitprop and the Minister of Culture of the USSR. Even Stalin was clearly feeling his line here with caution. So, the writer Simonov says in his memoirs that once, when, when awarding the Stalin prizes, Malenkov gave the real (Jewish) surname of the writer who was published under a pseudonym, Stalin cut him off, saying that this was not necessary. And Simonov's position was clearly maneuvering between the two poles of influence.

On the other hand, the current situation is characterized by an interesting fact, which Solzhenitsyn draws attention to in his book. In 1955, Dahl's Explanatory Dictionary was republished. The cover reads: "Typeset and printed from the 1880-1882 edition." But the text associated with the word "Jew" and its derivatives: "Jew", etc., is omitted (almost an entire page). In order not to break the pagination, a lot of coordinated work was required: editors of different levels, responsible for the set, etc. Why, then, each publication passed through the censorship (Glavlit). How was it all coordinated, how was it ensured that no one asked a question? Despite the fact that, for example, the

words "katsap" and sayings like "Be friends with a Muscovite, and hold a stone in your bosom" - remained. What was so unacceptable and offensive? - I don't know. This is truly some kind of ritual action!

How did Jewry and, on the other hand, the communist apparatus react to the emerging division of interests? The reaction of the Jews (as always) was very harsh. In a few years, from the support of the system, it turned into the most active opposition group. A striking sign is the extraordinary participation of Jews in the "dissident movement". Without going into the analysis of this complex phenomenon, we note that not all "non-governmental" actions of that time were noted with huge Jewish participation. For example, when it came to the fight against the pollution of Lake Baikal, with the project of turning Russian rivers, even with alcoholism, with the senseless oppression of the Church, it could not be said that Jews are more active than others. The energy was mainly concentrated on actions that were deliberately forbidden at that time, outwardly of a protest nature: demonstrations, a press conference for foreign correspondents, the publication of a magazine (most often it ended in one issue). The samizdat magazine "Chronicle" was published for several years, describing the persecution of those who committed such actions. And the dominating themes were: "ban on Jewish emigration", "Jewish children are denied access to education", "anti-Semitism is growing in the USSR,". The same topics were picked up by the Western press and especially the radio - and in this way they were propagandized within the country on a multiplier scale. The Jewish orientation of this entire movement can be seen from the list of the most developed topics, from the names of the authors, and on other grounds. For example, in 1971, VN Osipov began publishing the samizdat magazine Veche (a rare magazine not related to the Jewish theme, published for 2 years). Immediately in the "Chronicle" a message appeared that a samizdat magazine of "nationalist-anti-Semitic direction" had begun to appear, and the message was immediately repeated by Western radio stations. Osipov still has connections (in the camp) with one of the publishers of the Chronicle, and he drew their attention to the fact that the magazine does not speak of Jews at all. Then in the next issue of "Chronicle" an amendment appeared on behalf of the editorial board - that "Veche" is not an anti-Semitic magazine, although it is nationalistic. Foreign radio stations, of course, did not report on this amendment. Osipov still has connections (in the camp) with one of the publishers of the Chronicle, and he drew their attention to the fact that the magazine does not speak of Jews at all. Then in the next issue of "Chronicle" an amendment appeared on behalf of the editorial board - that "Veche" is not an anti-Semitic magazine, although it is nationalistic. Foreign radio stations, of course, did not report on this amendment.

According to the Latin proverb: "after this does not mean because of this," but it is difficult not to compare with this "discrepancy" that at the same time the attitude of the Western intelligentsia to the communist government in the USSR changed rapidly and

radically. After the war, Sartre wrote that rumors of concentration camps in the USSR should be ignored, as "this could lead to despair of the French proletariat." But in the 1980s, books on these topics became more popular - just bestsellers. For example, one of the French left, Pierre Dax, who during the period of "cordial agreement" explained that the camps in the Soviet Union were evidence of the complete elimination of the exploitation of man by man, now wrote an admiring preface to "One Day in Ivan Denisovich." The assessment of the communist system changes from a "brilliant experiment" to the "empire of evil". And there is reason to see the source of this change in the divergence between the communist government and Jewry. For example, the leftist publicist Isaac Deicher writes in Stalin's biography when it comes to the "case of doctors":

Now Stalin struck a blow at the very root of the idea that lived the revolution, the state and the party; he destroyed both the certificate of revolution and the letter confirming the ideological legitimacy of his regime. By this action, Stalinism committed suicide even before the death of its creator.

No matter how strongly this is said, it seems that it is close to the truth. Stalin, it seems, then ruined his reputation in the eyes of the West. Obviously, some vital centers were touched upon, in particular, those that determined the assessment of Soviet life by Western public opinion. Like a ship that listens well to its helmsman, this public opinion began to resolutely change its course. And soon the ship was already confidently moving in a new direction. The newspapers were full of statements from emigrants telling about the injustices and atrocities of Soviet life. The American Senate adopted a resolution on the dismemberment of the USSR. Left-wing French philosophers like Glucksmann and Levy were confident in their accusations against the Stalinists. Even among the Western communists, a trend of Eurocommunism emerged, seeking to somehow dissociate itself from the Soviet models.

What was the reaction of the communist government? Far from symmetrical! Even in propaganda literature, it was forbidden to mention Jewish influence. The expression "Zionism" was invented - formally using the name of the Jewish movement, which had the goal of creating its own state - but sometimes, as it were, hinting at Jewishness in general. This timidity proves that the government did not oppose itself to Jewry, did not feel it as its enemy. While the Jews who emigrated from the USSR filled the "Russian" editorial office of Radio Liberty and there they clearly branded communism with a slave and inhuman system, Soviet propagandists timidly babbled about "Zionism", reproaching it for eternal hostility to socialism and communism (Marx , Trotsky?).

Thus, in the 1980s, the communist regime completely lost the powerful domestic and global Jewish support that it had enjoyed for many decades.

LITERATURE

Shafarevich I. Russia in the era of communism. On Sat. "The Russian people at the turn of the millennium". M. 2000.

The tragedy of the Russian village. T.T. 1, 2.M. 1999, 2000.

Ivnitskiy N.A. Collectivization and dispossession in the early 30s. Based on materials from the Politburo of the CPSU (b) and the OGPU. On Sat. "The fate of the Russian peasantry". M. 1996.

Gorky M. (ed.). White Sea-Baltic Canal named after Stalin. From the series "History of Factories and Plants". M. 1934.

"Brief Jewish Encyclopedia". Jerusalem. 1976. Vol.4. Article "German Concentration Camps".

Who led the NKVD. 1934 - 1941. Quoted. in Ch. ten.

Agursky M, Shklovskaya M. Cit. in Chapter 10.

Bagritsky E. Memoirs of Contemporaries. M. 1973.

Semanov S. "Merry guys" or some transcripts of the novels of I. Ilf and E. Petrov. "Muscovite". 1992. No. 1.

Feuchtwanger L. Moscow 1937.M. 1937.

Stalin I. Works. T.13. 1951.

Conquest R. The Great Terror. Riga. 1991.

Kostyrchenko G. Captured by the Red Pharaoh. M. 1994.

Vasilyeva L. Kremlin wives. M. 1993.

P. Sudoplatov. Intelligence and the Kremlin. M. 1996.

Avtorkhanov A. The Riddle of Stalin's Death. Frankfurt / Main. 1976.

Khrushchev N. Memories. "Questions of history". 1991. No. 11.

Wittlin T. Commissar. L. 1972.

Reed D. The Zion Controversy. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Deutscher I. Stalin. N.-Y. 1961.

Sombart W. Die Zukunft der Juden. Leipzig. 1912.

Nordau M. Max Nordau to his People. N. - Y. 1941.

Toporov V. Double bottom. Brawler's notes. M. 1996.

Aharon I. Study of the demographic characteristics of the Jewish population of the USSR. "Culture" (samizdat). Moscow. 1976. No. 7.

Damansky. Hate technology. The Time and We magazine. Israel. 1978. No. 25.

Ryvkina R. Jews in Post-Soviet Russia - Who Are They? 1996.

Katz Zeev. Interview. "Time and We". Israel. 1976. No. 4.

Shafarevich I. Russophobia. Cit. in Ch. 1.

Simonov K. Through the eyes of a man of my generation. M. 1999.

Shakhovskaya Z. Jews and Russia. "Bulletin of the Russian Orthodox Movement". Paris. 1983. No. 140.

Solzhenitsyn A. 200 years together. Cit. in Ch. eleven.